

### REMARKS

The examiner required correction of a misspelling in the specification.

Applicants have amended the specification to correct the misspelling. No new matter was added.

The examiner objected to FIGs. 1 and 2 as showing an item label 12 without a corresponding description of said item in the specification.

Support for label 12 can be found in applicants' original specification at page 3, lines 19-20, wherein "(t)he firewall 10 is coupled to a communications medium 12 such as a wide area network or the Internet."

The examiner objected to claims 9 and 18 for including the phrase "capable of."

Applicants have amended claims 9 and 18 to avoid the use of vague and indefinite language. No new matter was added.

The examiner uses Braddy to reject claims 1-8, 10-17 and 19-30 as having been anticipated.

Claim 1 recites "establishing a virtual connection between a source endpoint located behind a first connectivity barrier and a destination endpoint located behind a second connectivity barrier."

Braddy neither describes nor suggests establishing a virtual connection. Further, Braddy neither describes nor suggests a virtual connection between a source endpoint located behind a first connectivity barrier and a destination endpoint located behind a second connectivity barrier. Braddy merely discloses a hard-wired connection and a request broker software system for handling requests to a first server. More specifically, at col. 5, lines 14-22, Braddy discloses:

In addition to intranets and internets, network firewalls may be used to form a third type of computer network known as an "extranet." An extranet uses a network firewall to separate an intranet from the Internet. The firewall must be negotiated, or crossed, to allow information to be transferred between the two computer networks. In this manner, an extranet may be utilized to extend intranet services, using the Internet, securely and selectively.

The examiner also relies on FIG. 17. However, FIG. 17 merely discloses application servers connected to a network that is further connected to a web computer system through a firewall. No source endpoint located behind a first connectivity barrier and a destination endpoint located behind a second connectivity barrier is described or suggested.

The examiner argues that Braddy's broad statement "(w)hile the preferred embodiment of the present invention has been described with respect to the distribution, monitoring, and management of CGI requests on the Internet, intranets, and extranets using computer systems with web browsers and web servers, those skilled in the art will readily recognize that the present invention may be implemented on other types of computer networks" discloses establishing a virtual connection between a source endpoint located behind a first connectivity barrier and a destination endpoint located behind a second connectivity barrier. Applicants disagree. Braddy fails to describe or suggest the quoted claim feature. This is at least in part because Braddy's invention, as described above, is only a request broker software system for handling requests to a first server. Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by Braddy.

Applicants' claim 11 recites "establishing a session between the source endpoint located behind a first connectivity barrier and a service and establishing a transport level communications connection between the service and the destination endpoint, the destination endpoint located behind a second connectivity layer."

Applicants' claim 26 recites "in response to a request from a first endpoint located behind a first connectivity barrier to establish connectivity to a second endpoint, to: assign a server to handle a session between the first endpoint and a service and establish a session initiated by the second endpoint if the second endpoint is located behind a second connectivity barrier."

For at least the same reasons as described with respect to claim 1, claims 11 and 26 are not anticipated by Braddy.

Claim 20 recites "if the second endpoint is located behind a connectivity barrier, a session initiated by the second endpoint is established with the service, and if the second endpoint is not located behind a connectivity barrier, a transport level communications connection is established with the second endpoint."

Braddy does not describe or suggest at least this quoted claim feature. Accordingly, claim 20 is not anticipated by Braddy.

The examiner uses Braddy to reject claims 9 and 18 as having been obvious.

Claims 1 and 11 are not rendered obvious by Braddy. Claims 9 and 18 depend upon, and further limit, claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, claims 9 and 18 are not rendered obvious by Braddy.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

April 15, 2003

Kenneth F. Kozik

Kenneth F. Kozik

Reg. No. 36,572

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110-2804  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906